

## **APPENDIX B - Open Project Selection Process (OPSP)**

To be eligible for Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) grants a proposed project must meet priority outdoor recreation needs as identified in the current Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan (SCORP 2003-2008), in addition to other program requirements.

Selection of projects to be funded by the LWCF program will be based on:

- A pre-application site inspection by a representative of the Maine Bureau of Parks and Lands (BP&L) to determine if the proposed project meets program and SCORP eligibility;
- A BP&L staff evaluation of existing recreation facilities maintained/operated by the applicant;
- Review of a complete application, including documentation and supplemental information, submitted by the applicant; and,
- Past performance (if any) in LWCF grant administration.

Selection of municipal grant awards is based on a competitive process designed to ensure that annual appropriations of LWCF funds are directed to projects that have a significant impact to a community, a region, or the State of Maine in general. Examples of projects that may be determined to have significant impact include, but are not limited to:

- Acquisition of property to prevent loss of an existing public outdoor recreation facility;
- Acquisition of land to protect critical natural areas and/or wetlands;
- Development of public outdoor recreation facilities to meet established, documented needs in a community or region;
- Development of public outdoor recreation facilities to serve a broad range of users including special needs populations; and,
- Renovation of existing public outdoor recreation facilities that serve an established, documented need (only if renovation is not a result of inadequate maintenance during the reasonable life of the facility).

### **LWCF Project Review Process**

Grant applications will not be reviewed for completeness or accuracy prior to distributing the applications to the review committee for scoring. Applications will be scored as submitted based on their merits.

The project applications will be reviewed, scored, and ranked using criteria (see “Project Review Criteria” below) approved by the National Park Service (NPS) and BP&L. The LWCF Review Committee is composed of volunteer professional park and recreation staff and BP&L staff. The committee will review the applications and recommend LWCF funding priorities to the Director and/or Deputy Director of BP&L. Recommended projects are then submitted to NPS for final approval.

### **Project Review Criteria**

#### **1. Project Type (10 points)**

- a. Renovation: Renovation of a public outdoor recreation facility that is at least twenty (20) years old. Documentation must be provided identifying when the

- facility was originally developed/constructed and when it was last renovated. (10 points)
- b. Combination Renovation/Development: Renovation of an outdoor recreation facility that is at least twenty (20) years old (provide documentation as described in 1.a above), and development/construction of a new outdoor recreation facility. (7 points)
  - c. Combination Acquisition/Development: The purchase of permanent rights (fee simple or easement) in land for public outdoor recreation purposes and development/construction of a new public outdoor Recreation facility(ies). (7 points)
  - d. New Construction: Development/construction of a new public outdoor recreation facility(ies). (5 points)
  - e. Acquisition: The purchase of permanent rights (fee simple or easement) in land for public outdoor recreation purposes. (5 points)

## **2. Needs Assessment (47 points)**

- a. Project is identified as a priority need in a municipal comprehensive plan/municipal recreation/open-space plan, and has documented community support. (15 points)
  - 1. Planning Effort (0-5 points): no plan (0); plan, but recreation facilities not mentioned in plan (1); vague reference to recreation in plan (2); reference to specific facility in plan (3); facility referenced with support in plan (4); facility is a major priority in plan (5).
  - 2. Community Support (0-5 points): no support (0); very weak support, no documentation (1); weak support, little documentation (2); support, some documentation (3); strong documented support (4); very strong broad documented support (5).
  - 3. Bonus Points (0-5 points): applicant's comprehensive plan is current and has been determined by State Planning Office (SPO) to be a "Consistent Comprehensive Plan" (3); applicant has a current "State Certified Growth Management Program" (5).
- b. Project Impact on Recreational Opportunity (10 points): little increase, similar recreational opportunities available (0-2); expands on recreational opportunities for existing programs (3-6); provides significant recreational opportunity not available locally or regionally (7-10).
- c. Project Implementation Priority (2 points): project may be delayed without serious consequences (0); loss of recreation opportunity or open space if project is not funded (2).
- d. Project Service Area (10 points): neighborhood only (1-2); large segment of municipality (3-4); entire municipality (5-6); multi-town/region (7-8); statewide (9-10).
- e. Intended User Profile (10 points): limited user or age group (1-3); organized publicly sponsored (team sports) activities (4-5); spontaneous activities for both sexes/several age groups (6-7); spontaneous activities for broad range of age groups and types of users (8-10).
- f. Participant/Spectator Use (5 points): mainly passive/spectator activities (1-2); team sport facilities without excessive seating (3-4); spontaneous activity (non team activities) areas with high participant to spectator ratio (5).

### **3. Site and Project Quality (40 points)**

- a. Appropriateness of the Site for the Intended Purpose (15 points)
  1. Location and accessibility of the site to intended users (5 points): poor access (0); fair access (1-2); good access (3-4); excellent access (5).
  2. Compatibility (size, slope, soils, etc.) of the proposed development with site characteristics (5 points): poor site (0); fair site (1-2); good site (3-4); excellent site (5).
  3. Bonus Points (5 points): site location supports alternative transportation options (walking, biking, etc.) and is consistent with Smart Growth Initiative goals to reduce sprawl and make more efficient use of public investment.
- b. Quality of Project Design (10 points): poor design practices, lack of information, vague description (0-4); design adequate but some details missing (5-7); good planning concepts, soils analysis/grading plan/design complete (8-10).
- c. Site Aesthetics (5 points): unattractive site (0); average (1); above average (2-3); outstanding natural area (4-5).
- d. Access for Disabled (5 points): limited or no ADA access, or no plans for ADA access (0); plans for ADA access at most major portions of the facility (1-4); all portions of facility are ADA accessible (5).
- e. Bonus Points (5 points): Site is a former Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) or Maine Department of Environmental Protection (MDEP) contaminated/hazardous site that has been re-mediated and approved for public use.

### **4. Cost/Financial Assessment/Capability (35 points)**

- a. Cost Analysis (10 points): cost estimates do not appear adequate for type of facility (0-2); cost appears to be adequate, but some information is lacking or unclear (3-5); good design and quality, cost estimate may be high (6-8); quality design with reasonable cost (9-10).
- b. Availability of Project Match (10 points): match not available/approved, questionable local support (0); match heavily dependent on future donation or other non-cash sources (1-4); at least 50% of match is available/approved, support for balance documented (5-9); 100% of match is available/approved at time of application (10),
- c. Maintenance Planning (10 points): maintenance planning unclear/resources inadequate (0-2); planning fair to good, resources adequate (3-7); planning excellent, personnel and equipment available (8-10).
- d. Condition of Applicant's Recreation Facilities (5 points): facility(ies) not useable (0); poor (1); good (2); average (3); above average (4); excellent (5).

### **5. LWCF History/Compliance (10 points)**

- a. Number of LWCF Grants Previously Awarded (5 points): five (5) or more LWCF grants (0); four (4) LWCF grants (1); three (3) LWCF grants (2); two (2) LWCF grants (3); one (1) LWCF grant (4); no LWCF grants (5).
- b. Five Year Inspection Reports (-10 or 0 points): Is applicant up-to-date on five-year inspection reports for all LWCF funded projects? Yes, or not applicable (0); no (-10).
- c. LWCF Signage (-10 points or 0 points): Does all of applicant's LWCF funded sites have all required signs on site? yes, or not applicable (0); no (-10).

- d. Verification of 6(f) Boundaries/Conversions (-10 or 0 points): Have any unauthorized changes been made to any LWCF project 6(f) boundaries? no, or not applicable (0); yes (-10).
- e. Application Preparation (5 points): poor preparation, apparent disregard of instructions, missing material/documentation (0); fair preparation, fair description of project/conditions, one or two major items missing or lacking in detail (1-2); good preparation, few minor items incomplete or lacking in detail (3-4); excellent preparation, well detailed project/process, no items missing, excellent plans and environmental assessment (5).